DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 524 IR 006 090

AUTHOR Deffenbaugh, James T.
TITLE Three Classification Schemes for Use in a Judaeo-Christian Theological Library: A Comparative Study.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cataloging; *Classification; Comparative Analysis; *Library Technical Processes; Religion; Special Libraries; *Theological Education

ABSTRACT

The classification scheme of the library of the Union Theological Seminary in New York, the Library of Congress Classification, and the Bibliographic Classification of H.E. Bliss are analyzed and evaluated regarding their comparative effectiveness for use in a theological library. All three systems are or have been in use in at least one specialized theological collection. Among criteria chosen for judging the effectiveness of the schemes are notation, hospitality, specificity, directions for use, index, and updating. On the basis of these standards, the LC Classification system is judged to be the most useful. (Author/JAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED157524

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THREE CLASSIFICATION SCHEMES FOR USE IN A JUDAEO-CHRISTIAN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

By James T. Deffenbaugh
University Libraries
University of Notre Dame

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James T. Deffenbaugh
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

IR000090

THREE CLASSIFICATION SCHEMES FOR USE IN A JUDAEO-CHRISTIAN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

By James T. Deffenbaugh

ABSTRACT

Three classification schemes, classification of the library of the Union Theological Seminary in New York, the Library of Congress Classification, and the Bibliographic Classification of H.E. Bliss, are analyzed and evaluated regarding their comparative effectiveness for use in a theological library. All three systems are or have been in use in at least one specialized theological collection. Criteria chosen for judging the effectiveness of the schemes in this particular use are notation, hospitality, specificity, directions for use, index, updating, etc. According to these standards, the system judged most useful among the three for such a library is the LC Classification.

THREE CLASSIFICATION SCHEMES FOR USE IN A JUDAEO-CHRISTIAN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Introduction

Even in such a secular society as the contemporary American ethos seems to have evolved, religion is, nonethess, evident not only in American history and traditions, but also in the present day. Collections of books on religion are customarily included in most public and academic libraries. Furthermore, theological libraries are liberally scattered over the country, since they are essential to the good functioning of seminaries and religious studies departments in public and sectarian universities and colleges. It is the purpose of this essay to examine and compare three possible schemes for the classification of such collections. The theological training and background of the author of this present study--including a graduate degree in theology and five years' work in the field of religious education--are largely limited to the Judaeo-Christian tradition. Unfortunately this constraint will have to be reflected in the study. Such limitations have been specified in the title so that the necessary restrictions of the present effort could be evident from the outset. Religious collections in which materials about religions other than Judaeo-Christian predominate must be outside the goal of the study, though it will be relevant to mention the inclusion of such material in one of the schemes discussed.

The three classifications selected for this comparative analysis are the classification system of the Union Theological Seminary in New York City, the religion section of the Library of Congress Classification, and the Bibliographic Classification of H.E. Bliss. All three of these schemes are or have been used in theological libraries.

Classification of the Library Of the Union Theological Seminary, New York City[1]

The classification scheme for the library of this pre-eminent American theologate was a fifteen-year project of Miss Julia Pettee, head cataloger, who began the re-organization of that library in 1907 and initiated compilation of its own classification scheme in 1909. The scheme itself has a philosophical basis, drawing heavily upon the philosophical classification devised by one Prof. MUnsterberg for the Congress of Arts and Sciences meeting at St. Louis in 1904[2], a system supposedly dictated by the psychological hierarchy inherent within human activity. On the practical level, Miss Pettee's work also borrowed from the extensive classed catalog already extant at the library.[3]

The notation selected for this system is mixed, consisting of one or two upper case letters followed by numbers. Cutter numbers are used, as well as either numbers or letters denoting special tables for standard subdivisions, to be discussed later.

The structure of the classes, which are labeled from AA to Z,

is indicated by six general groups, which are patterned upon the psychological structure of man's thoughts and deeds.[4]

General and introductory group	AA-AZ	Bibliography, libraries, journalism, encyclopedias, reference books, etc.
Literature group	BA-GW	Philology and literature, Bible, patristics and other Christian lit., etc.
Historical group	HA-OZ	General history, secular and church history by country, missions, comparative religions, etc.
Group of the sciences	PA-PZ	Physical and biological sciences, anthropology, psychology, mathematics, etc.
Philosophical and systematic group	QA-RX	Philosophy, ethics and moral theology, doctrinal theology.
Practical group	SA-Z	Social sciences, law, education, church law and structure, worship, music, pastoral theology, polygraphy, special collections, etc.

Special tables exist for: generalia; geographic place; works on particular denominations, societies and local churches; colleges and seminaries; designation of individual authors; and designation of classics. Often these categories will be dealt with in the schedule itself; and the designer of the system notes that these tables should be used only when the classes from the schedule do not include them. Generalia and geographic place are indicated by numbers and are to be added or otherwise integrated into the given class number. The other tables make use of upper case letters and are positioned below the class number, or below the Cutter number if there is one.

The only mnemonic device apparent in the classification is that numbers of the generalia table generally seem to mean the same thing whenever they have been integrated into the schedule.

Provisions for update of this classification seem to be largely of the in-house variety, with infrequent attempts to communicate the updates to the world of theological libraries. There are only two published revisions of the original 1924 schedule, in 1939 and 1967.[5]

A brief test was devised for this study to determine the hospitality of the three schemes selected for comparison here. Five theological topics were chosen which came into prominence either after or roughly concurrent with the issuance of the classification schedules: decrees of the Second Vatican Council, death of God theology, Catholic charismatic movement, theology of revolution, and situation ethics. Each scheme was checked to see if there were enough gaps between the class numbers of related topics to leave room for new groupings or subjects. The Union system was found to be only moderately hospitable, leaving tight and somewhat questionable places for the above topics, but indicating little possibility of expansion for vast new areas (The 1967 Union scheme edition does make specific mention of the Second Vatican Council; but the entries, two of them, are very difficult to find within the schedule and contain no denotation of particular aspects of the Council, such as history or decrees).

The relative index of the Union system is at the rear of the one-volume schedule. It seems adequate for use but not for facility. The index seems less than flexible, having few cross-references and omitting many sought index links.

Unfortunately this scheme gives few directions for use or scope notes. There are alternate classes for many subjects; but the preferred class is always stated so. There is one noticeable exception to both of these generalities. In the one extensive note to be found in the schedule itself, Miss Pettee discusses the Union system's tendency to classify many prominent authors in classes special to the authors themselves, instead of according to the subject matter of the work involved. Though she agrees that the topical value of individual works is to be considered as the primary basis of classification, she adds that at the Union library, the author as a person is often considered of primary topical value and is consequently the principle of classification for many theological works. Thus the personal author numbers in the Christian literature class provide

> . . . places for the collected works and biography of all theologians and any work by or about a Christian writer may be placed here provided it is not more usefully classed by topics. Current theological discussion, unless the man himself is significant, is wanted under topic.[6]

Generally, however, subjects of works by authors with special numbers are to be accessed through the subject headings of the dictionary catalog.

Special features.

Though this scheme has classes for secular and religious subjects alike, subjects related to religion are integrated into all six of the groups noted above. For example, the education section (TA-TX) has the following for its first four classes: education history and theory, religious education theory, pedagogy and teaching, church as educator. In like manner, the political history and church history of individual countries are always

considered as concommitant members of the same class. Miss Pettee explains the rationale behind this integration:

> The spiritual is but one of the faces of a complex but single and self-consistent universe. If we hold this point of view, I do not see how we can limit theology, which deals with the spiritual side of life, to a single department of knowledge in our general classification of the sciences. We can study the religious phases in all their various aspects. . . . Christian instruction and methods of teaching are wanted together; general medieval history and the papacy can hardly be separated, but a division into theology and non-theology forces these classes apart by half the library.

In this particular characteristic, the Union scheme's status as classification of a theological library is starkly evident.

Observations on the Union schedule.

First of all, the specificity of the classes representing early Christian literature and the patristic period are remarkably and admirably specific, assigning special numbers for even some of the more obscure Church Fathers and for individual works of the more prominent writers of that period. It seems clear that only a theologically specialized classification scheme would attempt such specificity in this area.

Surprisingly, however, the classification of topics in speculative or systematic theology, the R section within the philosophical and systematic group, seems less than adequately specific. Though schools of thought and historico-geographic class of writings, e.g., German dogmatic works of the 18th century, are treated with reasonable completeness, there is too often no specific place to be found for the speculative theology of a specific topic. For instance, no specific class exists for the theology of church (ecclesiology) or theology of prayer. While there are many entries for practical or historical treatment of these subjects, dogmatic or speculative treatment, that is, in the R class, seems to have been slighted.

Of course, such works can always be put into a historico-geographical class in the Christian literature group. Yet, surely this group was not meant as a hedge against lack of adequate specificity in other classes of the scheme. It is one thing to choose this category; it is quite another to be left with it because there are no other choices.

Also to be noted is that, as a quotation above indicates (see p. 5), Miss Pettee seems to recommend that works be classed by topic when the author is not significant. This appears to strip the systematic theology class of works by more profound and "significant" thinkers--an undesirable result and most probably an unintended one.

In any tailor-made classification system, the needs and goals of the user will, indeed, mold the system. In that regard, it seems clear from the Union scheme that the educational institution in question is a Protestant seminary which came into prominence at a time when openness to other sects was not in vogue, as it is now. Both Judaism and Catholicism seem to be of notably secondary concern within the schedules.

Finally, though Julia Pettee's belief in the unity of the spiritual or religious with all other aspects of the universe would strike a happy chord in the hearts of most theologians, her decision to integrate religious subjects into the entire scale of the schedule has greatly scattered the theological collection. For example, the following class and note were found during an examination of the schedule to perform the test for hospitality noted above:

Protestant English and American theological essays

RK 55 1914--date (Cf. IC 32, IT, JF, RD 55, SH 36, UA 23)[8]

To consult and compare all these cross references is inconvenient at best. The scatter of the collection and the seemingly inadequate subject specificity in the theology group make this classification system difficult to apply to books and other materials.

Library of Congress Classification--
Section on Religion

In the last generation, public and private university and college libraries have converted to the Library of Congress Classification; in fact, the trend to LC is probably irrevocable at this point for academic libraries. Of course, all such libraries are likely to have a collection of materials on the subject of religion. Such collections within libraries are rarely singled out by classing them according to a classification scheme different from that used in the rest of the library: most academic religious or theological collections are, in fact, classed according to the LC system. Furthermore, some seminary libraries have found the LC classification to be excellent for their specialized theological collections.[9] Thus, it seems reasonable to include the LC schedule on religion in a comparison of classification schemes for theological libraries. The present examination of the Library of Congress system is, for practical purposes, restricted to the second part of class B, BL-BX, religion, though admittedly many areas from philosophy, the first part of class B, will be closely related to or even overlap with some topics in religion: ethics and philosophy of religion are of special relevance here.

Since the LC classification scheme has no philosophical basis but is founded upon the collection which is extant and growing within the Library of Congress[10]--literary warrant--the dissimilarity

of the foundations of this scheme with that of the Union Theological Seminary library is immediately evident.

The notation of the LC scheme is well-known: mixed single or double upper case letters followed by numbers. The same mixed notation is also used for the first and second Cutter numbers.

The basic structure of the LC religion classes is as follows:

BL	Comparative religions. Mythology. Rationalism.
BM	Judaism.
BP	Islam. Bahaism. Theosophy, etc.
BQ	Buddhism.
BR	Christianity.
BS	Bible.
BT	Doctrinal theology.
BV	Practical theology.
BX	Denominations and sects.

Relatively brief tables of subdivisions are provided for denominations and sects, Eastern churches in communion with Rome, individual Roman Catholic orders and societies, age groups under the class for religious education, special parts of the New Testament, special parts of the Old Testament, and the literature of Judaism other than the Bible. Extensive tables of subdivision are provided in the very thorough 1973 LC classification additions and changes on Buddhism, dislodging the subject from its few class assignments in BL and converting Buddhism into an extensive class of its own.[11]

The test for class hospitality is slightly weakened for this classification, simply because the Library of Congress is working on the classification of new books and new subjects all the time--and they always seem to manage a place for new things. However, as

a structure itself, independent of its constant, day-by-day updating, the LC scheme seems generally spacious, except for the section on denominations and sects, which is very densely constructed.[12] Two of the five subject items chosen for the hospitality test could fit immediately into class numbers which provided a general categorization greatly specified by the use of date or Cutter numbers beneath the class number. For example, BX 830 is the class number for general or ecumenical councils of the church; this can be particularized by adding below the class number the year in which the council in question was opened. Cutter numbers are to be added below the date to designate decrees in the original language, by date, or in translation, by translator. Thus the decree of Vatican II on liturgy would be:

BX 830
1962
.A2
1962

In general, the LC religion schedule was found quite hospitable.

As might be expected, many areas of specialized interest to theological scholars are not specifically treated in the LC scheme. For example, the Fathers of the Church are not given a great many class numbers; there are no separate classes for authors, or even works, of this period, as in the Union scheme. In LC, "Fathers of the Church" is one class number; individual fathers are designated by Cutter.

The relative index to the entire B class of LC, both part one, philosophy, and part two, religion, is located at the rear of the religion volume. Thorough and easy to use, the index itself is often more specific than the schedule, in that the index frequently indicates what class and Cutter numbers should be used for individual writers. The schedule usually refers to author groups rather than individual authors.

Official updates to the LC classification system are effected through the quarterly publication of LC Classification--Additions and Changes, through occasional new editions of the schedules for the respective subject areas, and through the "Additions and Changes" section included at the rear of the progressively more recent printings of the latest editions of the schedules.[12] More current, though less systematic, updating can be verified through the checking of individual works newly cataloged at the Library of Congress and recorded in the National Union Catalog, the MARC system, or OCLC system on-line computer terminals.

Observations on the LC religion schedule.

Surprisingly, the doctrinal theology section of the LC scheme, BT, seems to offer more specific and more varied subject categorization than the Union classification system does. Furthermore, BV, practical theology, seems to set a tone which is often open to deeper theological speculation, even while being in the realm of the practical. In the Union scheme, on the other hand, this class seems more directly confined to matters of practical detail and of organization.

In general, the LC religion section seems to give relatively equal specificity to most general branches of Western Christianity. This scheme also contains more classes for Judaism and Jewish studies than does the Union classification system.

The Bibliographic Classification of H.E. Bliss

The final system of this study of classification systems for a theological library is the Bliss classification scheme. It has

been included in this comparative analysis because library literature records, some years back, that a theological library in southern California, with some fanfare and announcement to the world of theological libraries,[14] chose the Bliss system for use in its collection. The literature emanating from the Southern California School of Theology in regard to the superiority of Bliss for use in its library has been persuasive enough to indicate a further examination of its utility in a theological collection.

The Bliss classification is the product of fifty years' work by its designer, who constructed it on a broad yet penetrating philosophy of classification upon which he expounds not only in the lengthy introductions to the schedules of his system,[15] but in his important monograph, Organization of Knowledge in Libraries.

The notation of this sytem consists in upper case letters, with numbers either suffixed or prefixed for form subdivisions and lower case letters used to designate geographic place subdivision. Use of the comma and the dash are also part of the notation. The system frequently makes use, usually in the second and third rank of letters, of what Bliss calls "Casual mnemonics": e.g., AL is logic, HH is human hygiene, VA is architecture, etc. The system is not founded upon mnemonic devices but makes use of them where it can.

General tables include subdivisions for generalia and geographic place, as noted above, and by language and historical period. Special tables are included for particular classes where they have relevance: e.g., class P religion, theology, and ethics, contains a schedule for specification under religion, sect, church, or religious community and a schedule for subclassification under any religious society, community, or order, not a church or sect.

For the structure of the Bliss classification scheme on religion, see the outline which follows.

CLASS P

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND ETHICS

PA Religion, theology, and ethics--comprehensive works.

PB Theology, general and systematic.

PC Natural religion, natural theology.

PD Worship, religious devotion, "devotional" religion and theology.

PE Ethics and morals.

PF History of religion and comparative study of religions.

PG Greek and Roman and Teutonic religions and mythologies.

PH Oriental, or Asiatic, religions and mythologies.

PI Hinduism and other religions and mythologies of India; Brahmanism, and others.

PJ Buddhism.

PK Islam, Mohammedanism.

PL Judaism, Jewish (or Hebrew) religion.

PM The Bible, and related scripture.

PN Christianity: Christian religion and Christian churches.

PO History of the Christian religion and churches.

PP Orthodox, Eastern, or Greek Christian Church, or churches.

PQ Separated Eastern churches, and uniate churches.

PR Roman Catholic Church.

PS Anglican Church, or churches.

PT Protestant churches.

PU Christian church not historically Protestant, nor Anglican.

PV Christian churches and sects arranged alphabetically.

PW Christian societies, communities, and associations, other than churches.

PX Religious institutions, ministry, services, practices, in general.

PY Religious societies, communities, associations, other than Christian.

Unfortunately, though the philosophical base for this system has been thoroughly elaborated by its designer, there are almost no directions in the schedule itself for practical assignment of the notation to materials. Guidance in this matter needs to be sought out in secondary sources.[16] Scope notes and directions for alternative classification (the latter being a special feature of Bliss) are, on the other hand, frequent occurrences in the schedules.

At present, the Bliss Classification is maintained via the Bliss Classification Bulletin, which was published by H.W. Wilson of New York, also the publisher of the classification schedules, until the stocks of the latest edition of the schedules (1953) were exhausted. In 1967, when that happened, the Bulletin was then taken over by the British Committee for the Bliss Classification, which now publishes the Bulletin annually.[17]

The relative index seems an accurate reflection of the specificity of the schedules themselves, except that the index provides for more geographic names than are explicitly elicited in the table for same.

The Bliss section on religion, theology, and ethics, Class P, does not seem at all hospitable as it has been structured. Even before applying the test for hospitality, an examination of the structure of this class, as shown in the outline above, reveals that

PA-PY have already been assigned, leaving only PZ for new categories. The test for hospitality seemed to be only limitedly applicable to this class scheme, since three out of the five test subject items, situation ethics, death of God theology, and theology of revolution, were far more specific than any relevant classes supplied in the schedule.

This leads to what is perhaps the major difficulty in the feasibility of Bliss's Bibliographic Classification for use in a theological library. The P class, as it is published, i.e., without expansion, is hopelessly unspecific in the area of dogmatic or speculative theology. Unfortunately, the fine specificity afforded the areas of pastoral practice and church structure cannot make up for this severe handicap. The following list of subjects, all either presently or historically of major interest in theology, are not specifically treated in the P class or anywhere else in the classification system: Lord's supper or eucharist, justification, ecumenism, canonization, indulgence, holiness, and revelation. This situation is, surely, less than desirable.

The needed specificity of the P class might be increased if the schedules are expanded by the use of four-letter class numbers. Most of the classes presently in the classification scheme are of three letters: e.g., PBR, creation, God as First Cause; or PWJ, Friars Minor, the rule of St. Francis, Gray Friars, Friars Minor Conventual, Capuchins, Friars Minor Capuchin. If a fourth letter could be added to the three given in the schedule to designate greater detail within the class grouping, then specificity could be added. Bliss himself seems to imply that this is recommended, since, in a footnote to Schedule 16a in the P Class (for which no page reference

can be given, since the schedules contain page numbers only for the introduction) he designates the class number of the Capuchin Friars as PWJC--clearly a mnemonic expansion of the PWJ class given in the schedule and noted above. Such an expansion would greatly improve the specificity of the class; it may be, however, that the Bliss specificity problem in the area of theology is built-in and thus incorrectible without major restructuring. Such a restructuring would seem a necessary part of any official revision of the Bliss religion schedule. A new edition of the Bliss scheme has been promised for years by the British Committee for the Bliss Classification and is now, in fact, beginning to appear on the market, section by section, advertised and distributed by Butterworth's of London. Whether this second edition will contain a restructuring of the religion schedule remains to be seen; whether the revised religion scheme provides an increased degree of subject specificity may be a matter for further study.

It should be noted that the publications coming from the Southern California School of Theology on the use of Bliss in the seminary library there make no mention of any expansion of the Bliss schedules. In fact, the seminary head librarian says in a journal article that the schedules and the subdivision tables "provide for specification of almost unlimited possibilities without the need for promiscuous local expansions and adaptations."[18] An examination of the summary of Bliss schedules given in A Seminary Library in a State of Bliss, the fourth edition of the library manual, indicates, however, that the Bliss schedules for use at that library have not only been expanded and adapted in the area of theology, but in at least one case actually restructured.[19]

Comparison of the Three Schemes for Use In Judaeo-Christian Theological Libraries

As an aid to comparative analysis, the following ten books were chosen as volumes representative of a theological collection. Each book is given a class number from each of the three classification schemes.

	Union:	LC:	Bliss:
1.	John Calvin. Institutes of the Christian Religion. Tr. from the Latin.		
	GU 1 BE	BX 9420 .I52	PTC,C*
2.	Arthur Cushman McGiffert. A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. 1951.		
	FT 22 M14	BS 2410 .M14 1951	PO,AB M
3.	Harold Gilbee Anderson. Flying Visit; a Tour of the C.M.S. Front in Africa and the Near East. 1946.		
	NE 5 C65 XA54	BV 2500 .A3A54	PXW,N A
4.	Oscar Cullmann. Christ and Time: the Primitive Christian Concept of Time and History. 1950. Tr. from the German.		
	GW 28 C967 G	BT 78 .C82	PO,A* C
5.	Karl Barth. The Church and the War. 1944. Tr. from the German.		
	GW 28 B28 JCWG	D 744.4 .B2	PN—MDQ B
6.	Bernard J.F. Lonergan. Method in Theology. 1972.		
	RC 63 L58	BR 118 .L847	PB8 L

---

* designates a non-specific class number.

7. Rudolf Schnackenburg. The Church in the New Testament. 1966. Tr. from the German.

UA 42 S61 G	BS 2545 .C5S32	PMO* S

8. Gabriel Moran. The Present Revelation: the Search for Religious Foundations. 1972.

RE 23 M68 P	BT 127.2 .M864	PNA* Mp

9. Charles Journet. The Meaning of Grace. 1966. Tr. from the French.

RS 52 J71 F	BT 761.2 .J862	PNAG J

10. Ignatius Hunt. Understanding the Bible. 1962.

CD 89 H86 U	BS 511.2 .H93	PM3 H

After examination of each scheme for hospitality and specificity, and after working with the respective classification systems to assign numbers to the books above, it appears that the best-suited of the three schemes analyzed for use in a theological library is the Library of Congress Classification.

Bliss was ruled out because of insufficient specificity, even though, as is seen from the classification of the ten books above, the Bliss sytem generally has the shortest notation. When this advantage and this disadvantage are paired, however, the assets do not outweigh the liabilities. It seems inconceivable that Bliss could be seriously suggested for a seminary library without considerable expansion. Furthermore, it is difficult, confusing, and time-consuming to attempt classification of theological materials with specific topics by means of a class schedule with only very generic theological subject areas. Perhaps a

desirable expansion or adaptation of this system could be devised for a theological library; but why bother with such an enterprise when other and better schemes are readily available? Added to the inadequacy of subject specificity is the problem of Bliss hospitality, which, at least for this subject area, leaves much to be desired. Hopefully, the forthcoming new edition will shed some light on both of these problems within the Bliss religion schedule.

Apparently, the feasibility of the Bliss system use in a theological library began to be questioned even in the seminary library where its use had been espoused and heralded. Subsequent to completion of the above evaluation of the Bliss scheme for use in a theological library, the author of the present study wrote to officials of the library at the Southern California School of Theology, which has since changed its name to The School of Theology at Claremont, to inquire of the present status of Bliss's Bibliographic Classification there. This correspondence has verified that the Bliss sytem is no longer in use in the seminary library. In 1965 the faculty of that institution voted to change from Bliss to LC. The principal difficulties with the use of Bliss, as stated by the library director, were: 1) difficulty of patron use due to the unfamiliarity of Bliss; and 2) 100% original cataloging. A lengthy re-classification project has just been completed.

The Union Theological Seminary classification system was eliminated from preferred status among the three examined in this study because the specificity is wanting, though, of course, not so spectacularly wanting as the Bliss schedules. Also, the built-in

tension in the Union scheme between author classification and subject classification is a source of confusion to the classifier, who is always left with the question of where the book should really go. The relative index, being generally mediocre, does not make this problem any easier. Added to these difficulties is the fact that the application of the subdivisions in the schemes seems hard to learn because there are so few instructions as to how they should be applied to books and other materials. Once the notational system is learned, it seems easy enough to work with; and, though longer than most Bliss class numbers, the Union numbers do not seem overly cumbersome. Though the nature of the notation structure is acceptable and workable, the variety of class numbers that might be conceivably assigned to a work due to the scattering of the theological collection (See p. 7 above.) could definitely add to the time required to classify materials for one who is not thoroughly experienced with the schedules. It is possible that this is the price a theological library might want to pay for greater integration of sacred and secular subjects.

Finally, the provisions for update of this classification seem too random and incomplete for use during a time, like the present and the last fifteen years, when there is much ferment in the areas of church and theology.

There is one exception in which the use of the Union classification would seem preferable to the other systems discussed here: if the library in question specialized in early Christian literature and patristics, then the Union scheme would be of superior usefulness.

For many reasons, some inherent and others due to external factors, the LC religion schedule, BL-BX, was deemed most feasible,

among the three systems chosen for study, for use in a theological library. The following is a listing of these reasons.

1) The schedule itself:
   a) Has even and considerable class specificity, especially in the all-important Christian doctrinal theology class;
   b) Has great hospitality, except in "Denominations and sects," class BX;
   c) Has a very good relative index;
   d) Almost always classifies first by subject and then by author;
   e) Is easier to use than the other two systems, requiring less time and generating less confusion for the classifier.
2) Factors external to the schedule which add to its feasibility:
   a) It is part of a classification system widely used and understood in academic circles at large and also in theological libraries;
   b) Access to LC class number assignments for books is often available through the National Union Catalog, the MARC system, or OCLC;
   c) LC has the best provisions for updating among the three systems studied.

Some experts have criticized the LC religion schedule for inadequate specificity, especially in regard to books acquired from overseas and theological books with a particularly sectarian slant (e.g., Catholic books or Methodist books). And in view of this there have been notable and useful attempts to expand the religion

classes to increase their specificity,[19] though the advantages of special classification schemes for sectarian books probably need, in this time of greater ecumenism and less parochialism, to be re-examined. At any rate, the results of this study surely do not preclude the possibility that the specificity of the LC classes in question can and perhaps should be heightened. Nonetheless, when matched with two other classifications which are or have been used in theological collections--the Union and Bliss schemes--LC specificity compares favorably.

REFERENCES

[1]See Julia Pettee, Classification of the Library of the Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York, rev. and enl. ed. with corrections and additions edited by Ruth C. Eisenhart (New York: Union Theological Seminary, 1967).

[2]Julia Pettee, "A Classification for a Theological Library," Library Journal 28 (December 1911): 613.

[3]Ibid., p. 611.

[4]Ibid., pp. 613-4.

[5]Pettee, Classification of the Library of Union Seminary, pp. i, iv.

[6]Ibid., p. 104.

[7]Pettee, "A Classification of a Theological Library," p. 612.

[8]Pettee, Classification of the Library of Union Seminary, p. 489.

[9]Ruth C. Eisenhart, "The Classification of Theological Books," Library Trends 9(October 1960): 260.

[10]Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences, 1975 ed., s.v. "Library of Congress Classification," by John Phillip Immroth.

[11]United States, Library of Congress, "BQ: Buddhism," LC Classification--Additions and Changes List 168: Appendix.

[12]Eisenhart, p. 263.

[13]Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences, 1975 ed., s.v. "Library of Congress Classification."

[14]See Elton E. Shell, "The Use of Henry E. Bliss's Bibliographic Classification at Southern California School of Theology," Library Resources & Technical Services 5(Fall 1961): 290-301; and Southern California School of Theology, A Seminary Library in a State of Bliss, 4th ed, comp. by Elton E. Shell (Claremont, Calif.: Southern California School of Theology, 1962), pp. 20-34.

[15]Henry E. Bliss, A Bibliographic Classification, 4 vols., (New York: H.W. Wilson, 1953), 1-2:3-84; 3:3-188.

[16]Of particular usefulness in this regard is Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences, 1969 ed., s.v. "Bibliographic Classification," by Jack Mills.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Shell, "Use of H.E. Bliss's Bibliographic Classification," p. 297.

[19]Southern California School of Theology, Seminary Library, pp. 31a-31f.

[20]Eisenhart, p. 261.